UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,762	01/14/2004	Steven Maddocks	200315423-1	4235

22879 7590 08/29/2007

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
KEATON, SHERROD L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/757,762	MADDOCKS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	sherrod keaton	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the original filing of 6-21-2007. Claims 1-20 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yung et al (2004/0032430A1) in view of Blumenau (6839747 B1) and Burke(5613154).

Claim 1: Yung discloses a storage network comprising:

an interface manager communicatively coupled to each of the data access drivers and transfer robotics , the interface manager aggregating configuration information for the

data access drivers and transfer robotics in the automated storage system (Page 2, Paragraph 12), (Page 5, Paragraph 71);

an interface application provided in computer readable storage at the interface manager, the interface application generating user interface rendering data for the configuration information (Page 1, Paragraph 8) and;

an automated storage system including data access drivers that perform read or write operations on a storage media (Page 3, Paragraph 42), But does not explicitly disclose that transfer robotics transfer the storage media to the data access drives, However Burke discloses a system and method for management of transient data storage and further discloses and further discloses transfer robotics moving media to the driver (abstract; Column 2, Lines 12-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art in the invention to have the transfer robotics that also move the media to the drivers in Yung as taught by Burke. One would have been motivated to use the transfer robotics to also transfer media to the storage device to provide improve data management allowing user to monitor and control multiple storage medium/devices.

a graphical user interface operatively associated wit the interface application, the graphical user interface outputting the configuration information in accordance with the user interface rendering data (Page 6, Paragraph 75). But does not explicitly disclose receiving user input to change access permissions for hosts to the data access drives

and the transfer robotics. However Blumenau discloses a user interface for managing storage system and further discloses access permissions being defined in the graphical user interface (abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to have access permissions associated with the entire or individual devices of the system of Yung as taught by Blumenau because this a well known technique that is recognized as an ordinary capability of one skilled in the art.

Claim 2: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further discloses an interface application receiving the configuration information from a management pipeline at the interface manager (Yung: Page 4, Paragraph 49).

Claim 3: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further disclose the interface application including a state machine to determine a state of the data access drivers and transfer robotics based at least in part on the configuration information (Yung: Page 4, Paragraph 55).

Claim 4: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further discloses the interface application including a render engine to generate the user interface rendering information (Yung: Page 4, Paragraph 49).

Claim 6: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and but does not explicitly disclose displaying access permissions for the data access

drives and transfer robotics in table format. However Yung does disclose displaying instrument controls in a table format (Fig 5B and 5C) and Blumenau discloses a user interface for managing storage system and further discloses access permissions being defined in the graphical user interface (abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the access permissions in the table list of the modified Yung as taught by Blumenau. One would have been motivated to add the access permissions to the table display in order to show a listing of available instruments and security clearance of use.

Claim 7: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further disclose user input to deny and grant access permissions for the host to the data access drivers and transfer robotics (Blumenau: abstract; Column 17, Lines 44-60).

Claims 8 and 17: Yung discloses an automated storage system and method linked to a graphical user interface and method comprising:

generating a user Interface rendering data at the interface manager (Page 2, Paragraph 12); and

displaying the configuration information in an application window at the graphical user interface in accordance with the user interface rendering data (Page 5, Paragraph 71);

aggregating configuration information at an interface manager for a plurality of system devices(Page 1, Paragraph 8) but does not explicitly disclose including data access drives that receive movable storage media from transfer robotics in an automated storage system. Burke discloses a system and method for management of transient data storage and further discloses and further discloses transfer robotics moving media to the driver (abstract; Column 2, Lines 12-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art in the invention to have the transfer robotics that also move the media to the drivers in Yung as taught by Burke. One would have been motivated to use the transfer robotics to also transfer media to the storage device to provide improve data management allowing user to monitor and control multiple storage medium/devices.

Yung also does not explicitly disclose receiving user input in the application window to change access permissions of hosts to the access drives and transfer robotics. However Blumenau discloses a user interface for managing storage system and further discloses access permissions being defined in the graphical user interface (abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to have access permissions associated with the entire or individual devices of the system of Yung as taught by Blumenau because this a well known technique that is recognized as an ordinary capability of one skilled in the art.

Claim 10: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose an automated storage system as in Claim 8 above and further disclose displaying the access permissions for the system devices in the application window (Blumenau: abstract; Column 17, Lines 44-60).

Claim 11: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above and further discloses receiving the user input in the application window to grant and deny the hosts access to the data access drives and the transfer robotics (Blumenau: abstract; Column 17, Lines 44-60).

Claim 12: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above and further discloses receiving management commands for the system devices based on user input at the application window (Yung: Page 5, Paragraph 66-71).

Claim 18: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose a method as in Claim 17 above and further disclose user selections from the graphical user interface to add and remove drives from the system devices (Blumenau: abstract; Column 17, Lines 44-60).

3. Claims 5, 9,13-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yung et al (2004/0032430A1), Blumenau (6839747 B1) and

Burke(5613154) as applied to Claims 1, 8 and 17 above in further view of Dimitroff (US 6212606B1).

Claim 5 and 9: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose a storage network as in Claims 1 and 8 above and does not explicitly disclose a graphical user interface displaying a logical map of the data access drivers and transfer robotics. However Dimitroff discloses security and access parameters (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60) which perform the same action as a logical map, which is enabling and disabling user access of system devices. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to show the security and access parameters in the graphical user interface of Yung. One would have been motivated to show the security and access parameters for security and to give the user recognition of areas allowed to be modified.

Claim 13: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose copying all access permissions for a first host selection to a second host selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing host and devices having shared capabilities (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60),

(Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow the access and security parameters of the first host to be copied to a second host in the modified Yung as taught by Dimitroff. One would have been motivated to copy access permissions in order to allow the two host shared access and security improving functionality of the system.

Claim 14: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose removing all access permissions for at least one host selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow removing of access and security parameters of a host in the modified Yung as taught by Dimitroff. One would have been motivated to remove access permissions in order to allow improved user operability to edit, reorder or allow open access to that host.

Claim 15: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose copying all access permissions for a first device selection to a second device

selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow the access and security parameters of the first device to be copied to a second device in the modified Yung as taught by Dimitroff. One would have been motivated to copy access permissions in order to allow the two host shared access and security improving functionality and efficiency of the system.

Claim 16: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose removing all access permissions for at least one device selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow removing of access and security parameters of a device in the modified Yung as taught by Dimitroff. One would have been motivated to remove access permissions in order to allow improved user operability to edit, reorder or allow open access to that host.

Claim 19: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose a user selection from the graphical user interface to edit access permissions to the system devices as in Claim 18 above but does not explicitly disclose copying and pasting access permissions for a first host selection to a second host selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions in the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow the access and security parameters of the first host to be copied to a second host in the modified Yung as taught by Dimitroff. One would have been motivated to allow copy and pasting of access permissions to add efficiency to the process.

Claim 20: Yung, Burke and Blumenau disclose a user selection from the graphical user interface to edit access permissions to the system devices as in Claim 18 above but does not explicitly disclose copying and pasting access permissions for a first system device to a second system device. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions in the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the

time of the invention to allow the access and security parameters of the first device to be copied to a second device in the modified Yung as taught by Dimitroff. One would have been motivated to allow copy and pasting of access permissions to add efficiency to the process.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as necessitated by Applicants amendment to Claim 1.

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 8 and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as necessitated by Applicants amendment to Claims 8 and 17.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-

1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KRISTINE KINCAID can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

8-23-07

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100